DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 220 486 TM 820 499

AUTHOR Blumenfeld, Phyllis C.; And Others
TITLE Children's Cognitions and Feelings about Classroom Moral, Conventional and Achievement Norms.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Mar 82
GRANT NIE-G-78-0190
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (66th, New York, NY, March 19-23, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Standards; *Classroom Environment; Cognitive Development; Cognitive Measurement; *Cognitive Processes; Elementary School Students; Middle Class Students; Moral Values; Social Attitudes; *Social Cognition; *Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Working Class Students

ABSTRACT

The development of social cognitions about classroom life and their potential influence on children's classroom behavior were studied. Each of 360 first and fifth grade children from schools in middle class and working class neighborhoods were interviewed using booklets illustrating classroom behavior. The results indicated that children do differentiate among domains of classroom life; their cognitions of importance and emotional responses concerning behaviors are shaped as much by consideration of consequences and external realities as they are by developmentally based changes in comprehension of reasons for these norms. Age differences in perceptions reflect less extreme judgements of goodness and badness and less intense feelings by fifth graders, even in instances where they understand intrinsic rationales for expectations. The fact that rankings of importance and feelings did not differ by age suggests that across moral, conventional and academic domains older and younger children, in a relative sense, perceive and react similarly to the norms of classroom life. It is the degree of their evaluation and affect both that declines and becomes more consistent over time. (Author/PN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED220486

CHILDREN'S COGNITIONS AND FEELINGS ABOUT CLASSROOM MORAL, CONVENTIONAL AND ACHIEVEMENT NORMS

Phyllis C. Blumenfeld

V. L. Hamilton

Kathleen Wessels

Judith Meece

Paul Pintrich

The University of Michigan

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P.C. Blumenfeld

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The research was supported by the National Institute of Education (Grant NIE-G-78-0190). The opinions expressed here do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

TM 820 495

Children's Cognitions and Feelings about Classroom Moral, Conventional and Achievement Norms

PHYLLIS C. BLUMENFELD, V. L. HAMILTON, KATHLEEN WESSELS, JUDITH MEECE, & PAUL PINTRICH
The University of Michigan

Phyllis C. Blumenfeld
School of Education
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109

Classrooms are a fertile area for the study of social cognition because they provide a common core of experiences based on which one can examine theoretically the patterns of development of children's perceptions. They encompass different types of norms including expectations about morality, conventions and achievement. In addition considerations concerning both the reactions of adult authority as well as those of peers can be considered. Finally, it is important to understand the content of perceptions because they serve as powerful mediators of the effects of schooling itself (Weiner, 1972; 1979).

Results of observational studies (Nucci & Turiel, 1978) indicate that children do distinguish between the moral and conventional or procedural aspects of classroom life. Findings from interviews (Parsons, 1974; Weiner & Peter, 1973) show that children apply different standards when judging stories about morality and achievement, but are likely to give equal praise and blame for success and failure in each, particularly if effort is an issue. Others (e.g., Keasey, 1978) have suggested that the amount of praise for positive behavior need not be equivalent to the degree of blame for negative behavior.

However, although researchers have examined differences in reactions to success and failure in achievement situations and in the assessment of praise and blame for bad and good behavior in moral and conventional situations, they have not compared perceptions across all three areas simultaneously. While these areas can be treated separately for the purpose of experimental manipulation, in the actual setting they are not often easily distinguishable because of how teachers actually deal with them or because of how students perceive them. For instance, teachers emphasize procedure more than achieve-

ment, are more likely to threaten and punish procedural violation than academic failure, and often explain the first as caused by the second (Blumenfeld, et. al., 1979; Jackson, 1968). Thus, not surprisingly, recent findings indicate that children often cite adherence to conventions like being quiet and not fooling around as signs of ability and as the cause of good and bad performance (Harter, 1980; Stipek, 1981). Thus it is important to understand how and whether children distinguish among the areas of classroom life, and how they feel about them.

The purpose of this investigation was to answer the following sets of questions:

1) How good do children think it is to meet moral, conventional and achievement expectations in classrooms? How bad is it not to? In some areas is it better to meet expectations than it is bad to fail to do so?

2) Are there differences by area in how good children feel about conforming to expectations? In how bad they feel about not conforming? In some areas do they feel better about meeting expectations than bad about not meeting them?

3) Do reasons for why it's good to meet expectations differ by area? Do reasons for why it's bad not to differ as well?

4) What is the relation between ratings of goodness or badness, affect and reasons? Does it differ by area? For instance, do children think it is just as good to do well as to be quiet but feel more good when they do the former than the latter?

Method

Subjects. Three hundred and sixty first and fifth graders from eighteen classrooms were interviewed. Half of the subjects came from four schools in middle class neighborhoods and half from three schools in working class neighborhoods. Class composition of the schools was determined by conversations with principals about student background and familial occupations, as well as by the general industrial characteristics of the communities involved. Approximately equal numbers of boys and girls at each grade level were interviewed.

Measures & Procedures. Children's thoughts were obtained through a series of three types of questionnaires. Each child was presented with two sets of booklets with illustrations of classroom behavior in four areas - academic performance, social and academic procedures and moral norms. To facilitate presentation, behaviors were divided into "good" books and "bad" books, where the good books concerned doing deeds that one should, and omitting deeds that one should omit (completing an assignment; not hitting) and the bad books concerned the reverse (not finishing an assignment; hitting). No more than ten issues were included in any book; there were three booklets with a total of 28 issues presented in one session for the good books and three books containing 30 issues presented in a single session for the bad books. The additional issues in the bad books included teasing and tattling, for which comparable mirror images were difficult to construct. Order of presentation of issues was randomized within one set of books and then kept the same for the second set. Which set was tested first was then alternated within grades, and booklet order was varied according to a Latin Square design to control for possible effects of order of presentation. A full list of the issues used will be presented in the results section below.

Two quantitative measures were included for each issue to tap both cognitive and affective responses to classroom norms. Children were asked to assess how bad (or good) each thing was to do, and then asked to indicate "how they feel when they do" what was pictured. All children had first responded to a training task in which a very bad (good) and mildly bad (good) extra-classroom deed had been depicted and the interviewer had ascertained that they could differentiate the importance of issues. To assess the importance - degree of goodness or badness - of an action, fifth graders drew a line within preset boundaries of 250 millimeters. First graders, for whom such a task was deemed too difficult, moved a marker on a "magic line maker" where a red line was revealed when the marker was pushed. To indicate how they would feel when doing an action depicted, all children marked one of four faces that ranged from neutral to a large frown for bad acts and neutral to a large smile for good acts. Fifth graders were interviewed in groups, usually of five students at a time; first graders were interviewed individually. Since the fifth graders simply filled out booklets, there was no interference or sharing of answers between children.

Because different children might calibrate the scale for importance in different ways, we used a data transformation for the issue importance variable. This transformation uses the lines as measures of <u>relative</u> importance on a child-by-child basis. Indices of importance - degree of goodness and badness - were constructed for each issue by assigning the value of 1.0 to the longest line drawn by each child, and the value 0 to the shortest, with intermediate lengths transformed according to the formula (length - minimum length)/(maximum length - minimum length). For each issue, therefore, average importances reported across children can also theoretically range from 0 to 1.0, and results reported can be read essentially as proportions of the maximum range.

A more developmentally oriented measure of the reasons why children thought the norms important was provided for a subset of the issues. For the first booklet from each set the child rated, the child was encouraged to give up to three responses for why the behavior depicted was good or bad to do. Latin Squares for the good and bad books were staggered such that mirror image books were never presented first in both sequences; thus all students gave reasons for two-thirds of the issues, in either their good or bad book version. Pretests convinced us of the redundancy of asking students about reasons for each (e.g., why it's good not to fight and why it's bad to fight), both because reasons were essentially identical and because children themselves complained of the redundancy. In analyses presented below, results for issues are then collapsed across good and bad book versions. Answers were coded into two primarily intrinsic categories including consequences to the self or others and four primarily extrinsic categories including sanctions (reward/punishment), social approval from adults or peers, other extrinsic consequences (having to finish work the next day), and rules (it's nice to share). Average reliability for categorization was 91 percent.

Given that children could make multiple responses to any item, although relatively few did so, analyses involving reasons must be sensitive to the n. We therefore considered each reason type for each norm as a dichotomous choice by the child - mentioned/not mentioned - and conducted analyses in terms of percentage of children mentioning a particular type of reason for each issue (or domain, in more aggregated analyses).

Consistency measures were also constructed for the variables of importance, affect, and reasons. Since the importance measure was intrinsically continuous and the affect measures could readily be quantified by assigning numbers from 1 to 4 to the neutral to large smile (frown) faces, the consistency between

importance and affect can be represented simply by the correlation between the two within child. These correlations can then themselves be subjected to further analyses to explore structural determinants of consistency. Correlations can also be constructed at varying levels of generality, ranging from across the data set as a whole to within good or bad books, within domains, or within both type of book and domain. Since the reasons were qualitative choices rather than quantitative indices, it is not really appropriate to speak of consistency between reasons and either importance or affect, but it is a simple matter to ascertain whether there is an association between particular reasons and importance or affect scores by performing t-tests for differences between those choosing and not choosing a reason on importance or affect score. This can also be done at different levels of aggregation, as will be indicated below in presenting consistency data.

Results

Importance and feelings. Table 1 presents average importance and feelings ratings summaries for each issue as well as for each domain overall, separately for good and bad books. Grade differences, also presented here for convenience, are discussed below. In examining results or in particular in comparing importance and feelings data, recall that the measure of importance is a transformation of the continuous line data that ranges between 0 and 1.0; feelings data represent assignment of numbers, ranging from 1 to 4, to neutral face through large smile (or large frown) stimuli.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 1 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Certain general patterns appear across domains, as well as, predictably, differences among domains. A first general pattern concerns how students react to meeting an expectation ("good books") versus failing to meet one ("bad books"). Overall averages for good versus bad books show, across all domains, that children rate it to be better to meet a norm than it is bad to fail at one. In addition, they are consistent in rating that they would feel more good in meeting a role expectation than they would feel bad in failing to meet one. This pattern is somewhat surprising, given that children are supposed to absorb learning about doing and not doing "bads" earlier than they do about "goods" (Keasey, 1978).

Relative importances of the domains show clearly children's ability to distinguish moral from other more conventional issues and responses within social mor issues do suggest clues to how different types of norms may be viewed. In this domain there are clear distinctions between issues where children are taught "thou shalts" and issues where they are taught "thou shalt nots". Norms like comforting another, sharing, including others, and playing fairly call for the commission of behavior. Norms about such issues as aggression, lying, and cheating, in contrast, call for the omission of behavior. For the commission norms here, children consistently reported that it was more good to do the act than it was bad to omit it; for the omission norms, they reported that it was more bad to do the act than it was good to omit it.

The three other domains, more specifically related to classroom life look relatively similar with regard to how good it is to meet an expectation. It is interesting to note that almost all good issues are rated above the median but bad appear below. Most noteworthy is the fact that it was rated least bad not to fulfill academic performance norms and that children indicated they would feel least badly about not doing so. Among the procedural issues,

one essentially "moral" norm stands out: persistence, trying to do one's academic work. It is clear that children here perceived persistence as the best of the academic or social procedural activities when fulfilled and failure to persist as the worst violation.

Group differences in importance and feelings. The one truly overwhelming set of group differences presented in Table 1 above is the consistent difference between first and fifth graders. For every norm except cheating and stealing, first graders rated the actions as more extremely good or bad and indicated that they would feel better or worse, respectively, than was true of fifth graders. Grade differences on lines for importance might possibly be attributed to use of a different measuring instrument, as described in the methods section above. But the congruence of the reactions for feelings suggests that first graders were simply reacting with greater conformity to any and all norms. This pattern is consistent with our cognitive development-based expectation that responses of first graders would be less discriminating and more global.

To determine whether first and fifth graders perceptions differed in terms of the relative importance and affect associated with each of the behaviors depicted, comparisons were made of ratings by ranking both mean line and mean face scores by issue by grade and dividing them into quartiles. Examination of rankings showed no significant differences in the quartile placement of either importance or feelings scores. Thus, although younger children are more extreme in reacting to each behavior, in a relative sense, what norms they think are important and unimportant and how they feel about them is strikingly similar to older children.

Many fewer differences emerged between boys and girls and they tended to involve ratings of feelings rather than importance. Tests were made using regressions with grade controlled by entering it first hierarchically; the interaction of sex with grade was also entered, and will be discussed where significant. Tables therefore report partial correlations rather than means. Because there are multiple non-independent statistical tests made for such data, we adopted the decision rule that issues only be examined individually when the overall summary variable for the area showed a significant group difference. (This rule was obviously unnecessary for grade differences, where nearly every test was highly significant.) Table 2 shows the results that emerge for sex differences using this selection criterion.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 2 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The consistent patterns of sex differences emerge in response to the bad books only, and involve feelings only, in the academic procedure, social procedure, and social/moral domains. Results are quite easy to summarize: Girls always reported that they would feel worse about violating the norm. The other dozen-odd scattered significant effects, for lines or for faces in the good books, might not be ones that could be indiviaully trusted; but their pattern was also consistent with that found for feelings, in that girls always reported that it was better to fulfill an expectation and they would feel better doing so, or worse to fail an expectation and (as shown) that they would feel worse. Thus sex differences are simply sharpest with regard to feeling bad about norm violations.

Surprisingly, there were more significant differences between working and middle class students than between the sexes. These were also primarily concentrated in the feelings ratings, as Table 3 shows, but did involve importance ratings for both good and bad books in the academic performance realm. In contrast, for feelings ratings there were significant class differences in six of the eight possible areas, everywhere except in the good books for academic performance and procedure. Results can be readily summarized, as they were consistent across all tests: Working class children always indicated it was better to meet a normative expectation and that they would feel better doing so, or that it was worse to fail an expectation and that they would feel worse doing so. Thus working class children - even more so than girls overall - exhibited greater conformity to the norms involved in the student role.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 3 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Reasons for ratings and group differences in these. Six categories of reasons collapsed from the original coding scheme can be examined for patterns across areas of classroom life and for group differences in utilization. As noted in the methods section, two reason categories were relatively intrinsic, those labeled intrinsic and welfare; four were relatively extrinsic, those labeled extrinsic social, extrinsic other, reward/punishment, and rules. Thus in addition to examining patterns by specific reason type it is also possible to construct a composite intrinsicness index. Below we will present associations, and in the following section consistency measures, both for the reason types considered separately and for a composite index.

Table 4 presents percentages of children mentioning a particular reason type for each issue, arranged by domain of classroom life. The table also indicates the presence of significant group differences, which will be discussed after obtaining an overview of the general patterns by domain. It is clear from the table that certain types of reasons tend to cluster in domains, as evidenced by high proportions of children mentioning a particular type in one domain versus another. Among the intrinsic reasons, those labeled intrinsic show their consistently heaviest mention in the academic performance and procedure areas; those labeled welfare (for welfare of or consequences to others) are appropriately concentrated in the social procedure and social/moral domains. Extrinsic social reasons (essentially social approval), like welfare reasons, are found primarily in the social domains. Extrinsic other reasons - which were frequently of the "you have to do your work over" or "you'd miss recess" variety - emerge most consistenly, and again appropriately, in the procedural domains, both academic and social. Reward or punishment as a reason is offered most consistently in the two procedural domains. Its use is highly variable in the social/moral domain, but in a pattern which suggests a distinction between adult-defined offenses and those against peers: with heavy mentions for aggression, lying, cheating, and stealing, in contrast to the peer issues of comforting another child, sharing, tattling, or teasing, with playing fair in an intermediate position. Rules, finally, are offered with greatest frequency for social/moral issues, followed by social procedure issues.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 4 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The fact that the group differences noted here are for raw mentions of reasons type forces us to a cautionary note, given first the fact that children were allowed to mention up to three reasons and second the fact of the sheer number of tests involved. Thus we shall merely present broad patterns of differences where these appeared, and then reconsider the question with further statistical controls below. For example, grade differences appear quite sweeping, involving all reason types to some extent. For reasons labeled intrinsic and welfare, these differences are all consistent: fifth graders always mention the reason more frequently. But out of 25 significant grade differences among the external reasons, fifth graders also mentioned these more frequently in 18 cases. This would be surprising given the expectation of greater internality with further cognitive development if we did not remember the possibility of variation in numbers of reasons - and that fifth graders may be mentioning more reason types across the board simply because they are more verbal. For the much smaller number of sex differences, there are enough consistent patterns (by a criterion of covering at least three issues) to discern an effect for three types of reasons. Males mention reward/punishment and other extrinsic reasons significantly more, while females mention rules. Social class differences emerged a relatively large number of times, although less frequently than grade differences, and with two striking patterns. All of the eight significant class differences for intrinsic reasons showed the middle class children mentioning them more, while all of the 15 significant differences for mention of reward/punishment showed working class children making more frequent mention.

Of these sets of patterns, the most pervasive group difference - and the least clear in meaning - is that for grade. Consistent differences appear for intrinsic reasons, with fifth graders showing more mentions, but with a large number of extrinsic reasons also showing fifth graders predominant. The most unimportant group difference would appear to be sex, both in that few differences were significant and in that those significant differences were all concentrated among extrinsic reasons; boys apparently tend to offer more personalized extrinsic reasons, the extrinsic social and reward/punishment categories, in contrast to the girls' impersonalized rules. The class differences, intermediate both in terms of number of significant findings and clarity of the differentiation, suggest a middle class intrinsic versus working class extrinsic tendency.

The most important potential confound in these results is the number of reason types the child offered. Reasons were coded such that, although the child could offer up to three reasons, only different reason types were coded; two intrinsic reasons in a row, for example, would receive a count of one. Thus it is the diversity as well as the sheer volume of response that is at issue between groups. Comparisons by issue for grade, sex, and class differences showed that both sex and class effects previously reported stand unconfounded by the number of reason types offered. Of the thirty issue comparisons for each of these variables, there were a trivial two sex differences and one class difference on number of reason types. In contrast, 29 out of 30 comparisons were significant for grade, with fifth graders always offering more reason types. The diffuseness of the earlier significant findings for fifth grade mentions of reasons is thus partly a function of the volume and diversity of their responses.

Since the key substantive issue in any of these comparisons is the relative intrinsic versus extrinsic nature of the response, one attractive way of providing appropriate controls plus making the crucial group differences tests is to construct a measure for overall intrinsic versus extrinsic response. Although there are a variety of ways of doing so, one method which also controls for number of different reason types offered is to construct an index of intrinsic responses minus extrinsic responses divided by intrinsic responses plus extrinsic responses. Group differences on such an index cannot be a function of number of reason types offered. Further, such an index can provide a convenient summary measure for additional further analyses, such as those involving consistency.

Results for group differences on the summary measure of intrinsicness in fact identify the true significant patterns in the above raw data. In a hierarchical regression with grade entered first, followed by sex and class, grade proved to be a highly significant predictor of intrinsicness (partial $r = .29$, $p < .0001$); sex was not significant, while social class was also highly significant (partial $r = .20$, $p = .0002$). Fifth graders were indeed more intrinsic with a control for number of reason types, and working class children were indeed more extrinsic. Since the sex differences previously found were all within extrinsic categories, we would not expect any intrinsic-extrinsic differences to appear here.

Measures of Consistency in Child Perceptions

Importance and feelings. The basic indicator of consistency between importance and feelings ratings is the within-child correlation between the two. Such within-child correlations can be calculated at several levels of

generality, given the fact that 58 stimuli were evaluated. As indicated by the summary in Table 5, we assessed consistency overall, across all good stimuli, across all bad stimuli, within each domain, and for good and bad stimuli respectively within domains. The table presents the results from regressions in which we tested for effects of grade, sex, and social class on these consistencies. Looking first at the general results irrespective of demographic differences, several interesting patterns emerge. The general level of consistency is quite substantial, particularly in the light of the restricted range of choices available for the measure of feelings. Consistency is higher, however, for bad stimuli than for good ones, possibly as a function of the more extreme scores already noted for good ratings of both importance and feelings, if these essentially yielded ceiling effects. Domain differences are more unambigously substantive, with lower consistency for academic procedure than for the other areas of classroom life. Probing why this might be the case then moves the inquiry into the area of demographic determinants of consistency.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Insert Table 5 about here

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

The most striking difference in consistency, a predictable one, is that between first and fifth graders. All consistency measures, from the most general to the most specific, show higher consistency for fifth graders. Social class differences are less ubiquitous and less powerful, but they are still both common and themselves internally consistent, with working class children always appearing more consistent whenever there is a significant class difference. This class effect appears primarily due to ratings of the

good stimuli, but encompasses all domains except for academic procedure. When the domains are broken down into their good versus bad stimuli, class differences are revealed in the good and bad stimuli for the social procedure domain, in the good stimuli for both academic performance and social/moral domains, and in neither set of academic procedure stimuli. (In general, we would expect fewer significant results among the breakdowns by both stimulus type and domain, just in light of the smaller number and range of stimuli for which the consistency correlation is being calculated.) Despite a virtual absence of sex differences in consistency, the sole significant difference provide a clue about the previously noted lower consistency in the academic procedure domain; for there is a sex difference in consistency, there, with boys showing lower consistency than girls. Although the regressions comparing the sexes for good and bad academic procedure stimuli separately show no significant sex difference, as shown in Table 5, examination of average academic procedure good and bad correlations for boys and girls and their relationships to the other consistency correlations revealed that for boys, the consistency of the academic procedure good stimuli is distinctively lower than that for other domains; for girls, consistency is more even across domains. Among the bad stimuli, both sexes showed less consistency in the academic procedure and academic performance domains than in the other two. Thus the "something special" about academic procedure that renders it an area of lower consistency between importance and feelings appears to be the responses of boys to that area, and particularly to the good stimuli presented in it.

Overall, then, a substantial amount of consistency in ratings of importance and feelings was revealed, tempered by findings of differences between good and bad stimuli, among domains, and between demographic groups. The most

striking demographic result, the general pattern of greater consistency for fifth graders, was also in a sense the least informative. In contrast, the class differences in which working class children appeared more consistent were concentrated to some extent in the good stimuli, an area of overall greater consistency; and the only sex difference emerged in the academic procedure domain, with boys less consistent, possibly providing an explanation of the distinctively lower consistency in that domain.

Reasons. The relationship between reasons offered for the importance of issues and either their importance or the feelings attached to them is, as noted above, not truly a question of consistency; instead, it simply indicates whether there is some association between a particular reason type and the assessment of importance and feelings. The only associations that were anticipated were possible links between the intrinsic nature of a reason given and an issue's importance or feelings, with the expectation that reasons of an intrinsic type would be associated with ratings of greater importance or feelings; in contrast, we expect lower importance or feelings ratings for reasons of an extrinsic type. First associations between the six reason types for each issue were assessed separately for good and bad versions of the issue, by regressing the importance or feelings score on each reason type in an equation with grade entered first, followed hierarchically by the reason (scored as chosen/not chosen) and the grade reason interaction. Grade was used as a control because of its already-demonstrated importance in determining importance scores, feeling scores, and the consistency between the two.

Limited evidence of any association between any particular reason type and either importance or feelings was found. Out of a total of 348 regressions (28 good stimuli and 30 bad stimuli for six reason types),

importance scores were significantly different for only 14 main effects of reason type and eight interactions of reason with grade - well within what might be expected by chance, particularly considering that the reason types were not completely independent, given the limitation of three answers per issue that was imposed.

More conclusive answers are possible, given the apparently weak-to-nil relations between reasons and either importance or feelings, by turning to the summary index of intrinsicness. Use of that index makes possible two sorts of consistency check: first, a direct check for a link between intrinsicness and either importance or feelings ratings; and, second, an assessment of whether intrinsicness is itself associated with greater consistency between the other two measures, using the correlation between intrinsicness and the previously derived importance-feelings correlations.

Any direct link between intrinsicness of a reason and either the rated importance of a norm or the associated feeling proves to be absent. When grade is controlled, intrinsicness is uncorrelated with any of the eight summary measures (by domain and by good versus bad stimuli) for either importance or feelings. (Without grade controlled, there are a number of apparent linkages of intrinsicness to lower importance or feelings, resulting from the fact that intrinsicness is correlated with grade which in turn predicts to both lower importance and lower feelings.) Thus the small number of somewhat inconsistent findings noted at the level of individual reason types can essentially be ignored.

Similarly, intrinsicness proved unrelated to any importance-feelings consistency measure. While this finding serves to clarify the picture of the role of intrinsicness - i.e., it is not linked in any way with consistency

of response - it also illustrates that the demographic variables can have quite distinctive effects on different aspects of the data. Although grade powerfully predicts both the consistency correlations and the intrinsicness of reasons, the two are themselves unrelated.

Discussion

The findings presented have implications for understanding the development of cognitions about classroom life and for their potential influence on behavior. Generally, results agree with previous reports (Nucci & Turiel, 1978; Turiel, 1978) in that children did distinguish among the moral and conventional domains of classroom life with respect to cognitions of goodness and badness of acts as well as in their feelings about and perceptions of reasons underlying norms in these areas. However, they point to the need to consider whether the actor is adhering to or violating norms when predicting responses. For instance, children assigned high importance and affect to success at reading and math exercises but failure at these was rated and reacted to as among the least bad things to do. The difference in response to good and bad acts in the area of academic performance was more extreme than in the procedural or moral domains. Issues in this area received the highest ratings of importance and affect, overall and also showed the least change from good to bad books. It is intriguing to speculate that the divergences by domain reflect children's greater willingness to take responsibility for their good than for their bad acts. This tendency, however, is tempered by external considerations as well so that exceptions occur in the area that is the most likely to receive quick, consistent and severe adult reaction, violation of moral norms.

As anticipated first graders were uniformly more eagerly conforming, whether in terms of their thoughts about the importance of classroom norms or their feelings regarding conformity/nonconformity to them. The fact that they saw the issues almost identically to fifth graders in terms of relative rankings of importance and affect is quite surprising. We assumed that younger children would make fewer distinctions among procedural and achievement domains based on previous writings which indicate that the beginning school years are primarily a time of socialization into the routines of school with respect to learning the content of work as well as the appropriate procedures for accomplishing it within the context of a crowded, busy room (Blumenfeld, et al., 1979; Dreeben, 1967; Jackson, 1968). This prediction also stemmed from reports that young children use procedural conformity as criteria for defining success and ability (Stipek, 1981). These findings, however, are consistent with previous work which suggests that there are almost no differences across grade level in teacher communication about classroom behaviors (Blumenfeld, et al, forthcoming). The frequency of mention of moral, procedural and academic performance domains, of particular norms within domains, and the type of information such as reasons and attributions provided or sanctions applied was overwhelmingly similar. Children's cognitions mirror these invariant realities of classroom life. The fact that younger children's rankings did not differ from older ones indicates that perceptions of the relative importance of classroom norms are shaped early and are extremely stable across time. What changes with age is the intensity of children's reactions to these norms and their comprehension of the reasons underlying them.

Overall girls and working class children were more conforming in terms of importance and affect measures, although in the case of girls it was

entirely in the realm of their feelings and in the case of working class children it was predominantly so. Sex differences that emerged confirmed previous reports that girls are more concerned about classroom behavior (Brophy & Good, 1974). In particular, they seem to care more about procedures than boys, but not, it appears, because they understand them differently, at least in terms of reasons offered for why they are important. Social class differences found may reflect the greater emphasis on conformity and obedience prevalent in working class homes (Hess, 1970; Kohn, 1969) an explanation buttressed by their greater emphasis on extrinsically oriented reasons.

Consistency of ratings of goodness/badness of acts and affect was generally high for both grades, indicating that children care more about those things they think are more important. Overall, consistency was higher for bad behaviors than for good ones; within domain the inconsistencies were greatest in the area of academic procedure, where affect was lower than importance ratings. Examination of patterns of correlation for each individual issue showed that consistency generally is accounted for by the higher lines and faces of first graders and lower lines and faces of fifth. In cases with correlations below the median, the pattern of discrepancy showed that first graders were more likely to have responded with low lines and high faces and fifth graders the reverse. That is, first graders assigned more affect than importance when discrepant whereas fifth graders assigned higher important than feeling. This pattern, like that of the affect measure in general points to the decreased emotional involvement in classroom life by older youngsters.

The finding that the intrinsicness of one's reasoning bears no relation to perceptions of import or affective responses is noteworthy.

Although as expected, fifth graders proved significantly more intrinsic in reasons offered, they also earlier emerged as consistently rating conformity to norms as less important and themselves as feeling less good about conformity and less bad about nonconformity than first graders. Thus the intrinsicness of one's reasoning about an issue is no guarantor of one's evaluation of it or one's feeling about it. Similarly, working class children both gave more extrinsic reasons than middle class children and, where they differed at all, rated normative conformity more favorably and their feelings as more intense. The supposedly more internalized (intrinsic) response need not be the more intense nor need it be accompanied by greater normative or behavioral conformity. It may, it appears, even be accompanied by less.

One reason for the lack of relation may be that perceptions of importance and affective reactions are shaped first by external considerations like adult applied sanctions and only later by other considerations like more inherent consequences to others or the self. In both cases the behaviors in question may remain important--the reasons for thinking so differ. Moreover, as awareness of intrinsic reasons increase, awareness of extrinsic ones does not necessarily decrease, or become less influential. Essentially, intrinsic and extrinsic explanations, while conceptually distinct are in reality not always separable. Children are not left to their own devices in classrooms; those who do not perceive the inherent rationale for following procedures and doing work must do so anyway. The teacher is likely to enforce adherence to moral, procedural and performance norms regardless of the child's comprehension of the reason why.

The probability and severity of adult reaction more likely influences perceptions of the goodness and badness and feelings about behavior, irrespective of perceptions of the underlying rationales for expectations. The predominance of extrinsic reasons like "you have to do it at recess," or "you have to do it at home" along with intrinsic ones about learning, means that youngsters know that work must be done, regardless and not necessarily because it teaches you something. Thus, although youngsters understand that doing poor quality work means failure to learn, their perceptions that poor performance on math or reading exercises is less bad than failure to complete work may reflect that fact that teachers are not as likely to respond as intensely to inadequate papers as they are to failure to finish work. Similarly, while teachers talk a lot about talking, as compared to stealing or hitting, their reactions to it are less consistent and certainly less dramatic. The finding that while children perceive moral norms as the most important overall, they view peer oriented ones that are perhaps less likely to be sanctioned by an adult like sharing, teasing and playing fair as somewhat less so, provides additional support for this suggestion.

On the whole the results indicated that children do differentiate among domains of classroom life; their cognitions of importance and emotional responses concerning behaviors are shaped as much by consideration of consequences and external realities as they are by developmentally based changes in comprehension of reasons for these norms. Age differences in perceptions reflect less extreme judgements of goodness and badness and less intense feelings by fifth graders, even in instances where they understand intrinsic rationales for expectations. The fact that rankings of importance and feelings did not differ by age suggests that across moral, conventional

and academic domains older and younger children, in a relative sense, perceive and react similarly to the norms of classroom life. It is the degree of their evaluation and affect both that declines and becomes more consistent over time.

Table 1

Student thought about classroom norms by domain:

Importance (lines) and feelings (faces) for each norm

A. Academic Performance

Issue	Importance				Feelings			
	Overall	First Grade	Fifth Grade	Significance level	Overall	First Grade	Fifth Grade	Significance level
OVERALL	.66	.74	.59	d	3.23	3.45	3.01	d
Math Content	.74	.80	.70	c	3.50	3.58	3.42	a
Language Content	.70	.75	.65	c	3.30	3.47	3.14	d
Other Content	.63	.70	.57	d	3.26	3.47	3.08	d
Language Format	.57	.68	.47	d	2.90	3.27	2.57	d
Math Format	.66	.76	.58	d	3.11	3.44	2.81	d
OVERALL	.46	.57	.37	d	2.74	3.12	2.39	d
Math Content	.54	.61	.48	d	3.07	3.27	2.90	c
Language Content	.55	.62	.49	c	2.92	3.14	2.72	d
Other Content	.40	.52	.29	d	2.64	3.12	2.21	d
Language Format	.34	.48	.21	d	2.29	2.80	1.82	d
Math Format	.52	.64	.40	d	2.76	3.25	2.31	d

a) t - test $p \leq .05$
b) $p \leq .01$
c) $p \leq .001$
d) $p \leq .0001$

B. Academic Procedure

Issue	Importance				Feelings			
	Overall	First Grade	Fifth Grade	Significance level	Overall	First Grade	Fifth Grade	Significance level
OVERALL	.68	.76	.60	d	3.09	3.43	2.79	d
On-Task	.68	.78	.59	d	3.06	3.47	2.69	d
Assistance	.65	.76	.55	d	3.01	3.38	2.68	d
Persistence	.75	.82	.68	d	3.78	3.48	2.92	d
Readiness	.64	.69	.59	b	3.07	3.42	2.76	d
Routine	.65	.75	.56	d	2.96	3.37	2.58	d
Completion	.70	.76	.64	c	3.27	3.47	3.08	d
OVERALL	.59	.68	.51	d	2.91	3.23	2.63	d
On-Task	.64	.75	.53	d	2.99	3.36	2.66	d
Assistance	.57	.67	.47	d	2.85	3.23	2.49	d
Persistence	.68	.76	.61	d	3.07	3.31	2.85	d
Readiness	.51	.56	.47	b	2.72	2.91	2.55	c
Routine	.62	.71	.53	d	2.99	3.36	2.65	d
Completion	.53	.63	.44	d	2.87	3.22	2.55	d

a) t - test $p \leq .05$
b) $p \leq .01$
c) $p \leq .001$
d) $p \leq .0001$

Table 1 (con't)

C. Social Procedure

Issue	Importance				Feelings			
	Overall	First Grade	Fifth Grade	Significance level	Overall	First Grade	Fifth Grade	Significance level
GOOD BOOKS								
OVERALL	.62	.73	.53	d	2.93	3.36	2.55	d
Materials	.69	.78	.60	d	3.12	3.50	2.78	d
Place	.55	.68	.44	d	2.79	3.27	2.35	d
Lining Up	.57	.69	.45	d	2.82	3.30	2.39	d
General	.59	.68	.50	d	2.81	3.25	2.41	d
Turn Taking	.64	.73	.55	d	2.97	3.34	2.63	d
Role	.64	.71	.57	d	3.00	3.42	2.63	d
Late	.63	.73	.54	d	2.93	3.38	2.53	d
Cleaning Up	.70	.81	.60	d	3.06	3.47	2.71	d
Noise	.62	.72	.53	d	2.89	3.32	2.50	d
BAD BOOKS								
OVERALL	.58	.69	.47	d	2.82	3.21	2.47	d
Materials	.64	.77	.52	d	3.03	3.44	2.65	d
Place	.43	.57	.31	d	2.42	2.88	2.00	d
Lining Up	.56	.70	.44	d	2.74	3.26	2.25	d
General	.67	.77	.58	d	2.99	3.35	2.66	d
Turn Taking	.61	.71	.51	d	2.89	3.26	2.56	d
Role	.63	.71	.56	d	3.04	3.25	2.85	d
Late	.39	.48	.31	d	2.44	2.80	2.11	d
Cleaning Up	.66	.79	.53	d	3.03	3.40	2.69	d
Noise	.60	.75	.48	d	2.84	3.25	2.47	d

a) t-test $p \leq .05$
b) $p \leq .01$
c) $p \leq .001$
d) $p \leq .0001$

Table 1 (cont.)

D. Social/Moral

	Issue	Importance				Feelings			
		Overall	First Grade	Fifth Grade	Significance level	Overall	First Grade	Fifth Grade	Significance level
GOOD BOOKS	OVERALL	.73	.81	.66	d	3.21	3.50	2.95	d
	Comforting	.78	.84	.72	d	3.33	3.55	3.14	d
	Aggression	.70	.83	.59	d	3.13	3.45	2.84	d
	Lying	.77	.83	.71	d	3.18	3.51	2.87	d
	Sharing	.70	.76	.65	c	3.21	3.45	3.00	d
	Include Others	.68	.77	.60	d	3.19	3.56	2.84	d
	Playing Fair	.65	.75	.57	d	3.09	3.47	2.74	d
	Cheating	.76	.82	.70	c	3.24	3.52	2.99	d
	Stealing	.79	.83	.75	b	3.33	3.50	3.18	c
BAD BOOKS	OVERALL	.69	.76	.63	d	3.14	3.40	2.91	d
	Comforting	.65	.74	.56	d	3.12	3.47	2.80	d
	Aggression	.78	.86	.71	d	3.30	3.57	3.05	d
	Lying	.84	.89	.80	c	3.55	3.68	3.42	c
	Sharing	.57	.69	.46	d	2.91	3.39	2.47	d
	Include Others	.63	.73	.54	d	2.96	3.24	2.72	d
	Playing Fair	.54	.60	.49	b	2.84	3.10	2.60	d
	Cheating	.83	.84	.82	n.s.	3.45	3.51	3.41	n.s
	Stealing	.89	.89	.90	n.s.	3.66	3.68	3.64	n.s.
	Tattling	.55	.64	.46	d	2.72	3.03	2.44	d
	Teasing	.63	.74	.53	d	2.93	3.32	2.56	d

a) t - test p
b) $p \leq .01$
c) $p \leq .001$
d) $p \leq .0001$

Table 2

Partial correlations for significant sex differences in feelings ratings.

	Domain and Issue	Partial r's	Significance Level
Bad Books	Academic Procedure		
	Overall	.14	.01
	On Task	.16	.002
	Routine	.11	.04
Bad Books	Social Procedure		
	Overall	.15	.005
	Lining Up	.14	.009
	General Social Procedure	.12	.03
	Late	.14	.01
	Cleaning Up	.12	.03
	Noise	.15	.007
Bad Books	Social/Moral		
	Overall	.21	.0001
	Comforting	.14	.01
	Aggression	.15	.007
	Lying	.16	.004
	Sharing	.15	.005
	Tattling	.12	.03
	Teasing	.14	.008

Table 3

Partial correlations for significant social class differences in importance or feelings ratings

	Domain and Issue	Importance Partial r	Importance Significance	Feelings Partial r	Feelings Significanc
Good Books	Academic Performance				
	Overall	.12	.02		
	Language Content	.12	.03		
	Other Content	.18	.0006		
Bad Books	Academic Performance				
	Overall	.20	.0003	.20	.000
	Other Content	.24	<.0001	.20	.000
	Language Format	.11	.05	.15	.007
	Math Format	.14	.01	.19	.000
Bad Books	Academic Procedure				
	Overall		n.s.	.17	.002
	On task			.14	.01
	Assistance			.12	.02
	Routine			.19	.000
Good Books	Social Procedure				
	Overall		n.s.	.11	.05
Bad Books	Social Procedure				
	Overall		n.s.	.20	.000
	Materials			.11	.05
	Place			.15	.005
	Lining Up			.18	.001
	Turn Taking			.15	.007
	Cleaning Up			.16	.003
	Noise			.16	.003
Good Books	Social/Moral				
	Overall		n.s.	.12	.03
	Aggression			.24	<.000
	Including Others			.11	.05
	Playing fair			.12	.03
Bad Books	Social/Moral				
	Overall		n.s.	.11	.04
	Sharing			.14	.008

Table 4

Perceptions of reasons for norms:

Percent of children mentioning each reason type by domain and issue*

	REASONS					
	Intrinsic		Extrinsic			
	Intrinsic	Welfare	Extrinsic-Social	Extrinsic-Other	Reward/Punishment	Rules
A. Academic Outcome						
Issue						
Math Content	47.1[a,c]	4.0	10.2	24.4	29.8[a,c]	4.9
Language Content	44.9[a,c]	4.0	11.6	26.2	27.1[a,b,c]	5.3
Language Format	19.7	44.1[c]	6.7	7.6	7.1	6.3[b]
Math Format	8.8	40.7[a]	9.7[a]	37.5[a]	15.3[a]	7.4
Other Content	31.9[a,c]	10.2[c]	23.6	9.7	25.9[a,c]	5.6
B. Academic Procedure						
Issue						
On-task	33.2[a,b,c]	2.1	8.4	32.8[a]	44.5[c]	5.0[c]
Assistance	10.5[a]	45.0[a]	6.7	16.8[b]	15.1	20.2[a]
Persistence	49.2[a]	2.9[c]	4.6	24.4[b]	19.7	12.6[a]
Readiness	28.2	8.4	2.5	45.8	15.5	5.5
Routine	26.4	2.8	4.2[a,b]	46.8[a]	20.4[c]	9.3
Completion	20.4	3.2[c]	3.7	50.0[b]	31.0[a,c]	4.2

*Differences in proportion of children mentioning each reason by sex, age, and socioeconomic status.

a=grade
b=sex
c=SES

Table 4 (continued)

	REASONS					
	Intrinsic		Extrinsic			
	Intrinsic	Welfare	Extrinsic-Social	Extrinsic-Other	Reward/Punishment	Rules
C. Social Procedure						
Issue						
Materials	3.6	65.3[a]	6.2[a]	14.2	13.8[a]	11.1[b,c]
Place	15.6	23.6[a]	6.7	22.2	33.8	12.9
Lining Up	4.9[a]	31.6[a]	21.8	16.0[a]	32.0	12.4[b]
General	9.7	55.0[a,b]	8.4[c]	10.1	30.3[a,c]	18.1[b]
Turn Taking	2.5[b]	52.9[a,c]	12.6	9.2[a]	19.7[c]	22.3
Role	7.6[b]	51.3[a]	13.0	16.0	20.6[a]	17.2
Late	37.5	6.9[a]	4.6	38.4[a]	24.1[a,b]	2.8
Cleaning Up	8.8[a]	52.8[a]	13.4	21.8[b]	19.4[c]	11.1[c]
Noise	17.1	63.4[a,c]	6.0	12.0	19.4	6.0
D. Social/Moral						
Issue						
Comforting	12.9[c]	54.7[a]	19.1[a,c]	0.4	2.2[a,b,c]	14.7[b]
Aggression	4.4[a,c]	52.4	19.1[a]	26.2	28.4[a]	10.7
Lying	8.0[a]	41.8[a]	16.9[a]	7.6	45.3[a]	11.1
Sharing	19.1[a]	50.7	32.9[a]	4.0	4.4[c]	18.2[b]
Include Others	8.0[a]	61.3[a]	21.8	5.3	2.7	10.2[b]
Playing Fair	49.2[a]	22.7[a]	26.5	14.7	13.9[a]	25.6
Cheating	39.4[a,c]	8.3	7.9	37.5	25.0[c]	13.0
Stealing	13.9[a]	42.6	6.0[a]	4.2	31.9[b,c]	30.1[b]
Tattling	3.8	13.9[a]	14.3[a]	2.5	6.3	9.7[b]
Teasing	1.9	36.6	10.2	1.4	6.0	6.5

Table 5

Consistency between importance and feelings ratings plus consistency differences by grade, sex, and social class.

Consistency measure	Overall r	Significant partials for effect of: Grade (1/5)	Sex (M/F)	Class (middle/working)
Overall	.54	.35[c]	-	.18[c]
Overall good	.47	.29[c]	-	.21[c]
Overall bad	.57	.36[c]	-	-
Academic performance	.51	.26[c]	-	.12[a]
-good	.41	.17[b]	-	.18[b]
-bad	.42	.23[c]	-	-
Academic procedure	.44	.18[c]	.13[a]	-
-good	.36	.14[a]	-	-
-bad	.42	.20[c]	-	-
Social procedure	.50	.18[b]	-	.21[c]
-good	.42	.15[b]	-	.18[b]
-bad	.50	.14[a]	-	.16[b]
Social/moral	.52	.33[c]	-	.15[b]
-good	.42	.22[c]	-	.15[a]
-bad	.55	.38[c]	-	-

a) $p \leq .05$

b) $p \leq .01$

c) $p \leq .001$

References

Blumenfeld, P., Hamilton, V. L., Wessels, K., & Falkner, D. Teaching responsibility to first graders. Theory into Practice, 1979, 28, 174-180.

Blumenfeld, P., Hamilton, V. L., Bossert, S., Wessels, K., & Meece, J. Teacher talk and student thought: Socialization into the student role. In J. Levine & M. Wang (Eds.). Teacher and student perception: Implications for learning. Hinsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates, in press.

Brophy, J. & Good, T. Teacher-student relationships: Causes and consequences. New York: Holt, 1974.

Dreeben, R. The contribution of schooling to the learning of norms. Harvard Educational Review, Spring 1967, 37, 211-237.

Dweck, C. S., Davidson, W., Nelson, S., & Enna, B. Sex differences in learned helplessness: (II) The contingencies of evaluative feedback in classrooms and (III) An experimental analysis. Developmental Psychology, 1978, 14, 268-276.

Harter, S. A model of intrinsic mastery motivation in children: Individual differences and developmental change. Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology, Volume 14, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980.

Hess, R. Class and ethnic influences upon socialization. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Carmichaels's manual of child psychology, Volume 2, New York: Wiley, 1970.

Jackson, P. Life in classrooms. New York: Holt, 1968.

Keasey, C. Children's developing awareness and usage of intentionality and motives. Nebraska symposium on motivation, Volume 25. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1978.

Kohn, M. Class and conformity. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey, 1969.

Nucci, L. & Turiel, E. Social interactions and the development of social concepts in preschool children. Child Development, 1978, 49, 400-407.

Parsons, J. Causal attribution and the role of situational cues in the development of children's evaluative judgments. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of California, Los Angeles, 1974.

Stipek, D. Children's perceptions of their own and their classmates' ability. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1981, 73, 404-410.

Turiel, E. Distinct conceptual and developmental domains. Social conventions and morality. In C. B. Keasey (Ed.), Nebraska symposium on motivation, Volume 25, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1978.

Weiner, B. Theories of motivation. Chicago: Markham Publishing Company, 1972.

Weiner, B. A theory of motivation for some classroom experiences. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1979, 71, 3-25.

Weiner, B., & Peter, N. A. A cognitive-developmental analysis of achievement and moral judgments. Developmental Psychology, 1973, 9, 290-309.